(1) Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
041211 SEP 27 2004
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
(mother of minor child) E.C.,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
160 Alberge Lane
Baltimore, MD 21220
410-335-0191

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Should a procedure, rule or statue or law error be allowed to violate a person's Constitutional Rights?
2. Should my son suffer from my error because I had missed a step in the procedure in the United States Circuit Court?
3. Will you take into consideration that I am poor and cannot afford the price of a lawyer? This is pro bono.
4. Who has the right to appeal a juvenile case? The parents or the child?
5. When a juvenile parent appeals, does the Appeals Court have the right to change that appeal? Or are they bonded to answer that parent (or the person that originally filed)?
6. Could an appeal be called a legal part of a binding contract?
7. Does Automatic Waiver contradict the laws in which the people know?
8. Does it jump from point A to point D leaving B and C open? Point A is the arrest; D is the conviction.
9. Does this violate the chain of the courts?
10. Who really has the power to waiver a child before he has been charged?
11. Could this Statute of Automatic Waiver be the beginning of a domino effect? Does it pose a conflict and create a problem in the Appeals process?
12. Is a Juvenile capable of comprehending the law and the Appeals process?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

13. Will it show prejudice? Discrimination? Violate the civil, constitutional, or human rights, due process, Fifth, Sixth or Eighth Amendments?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

1. *United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit* Suite 501, 1100 E. Maine, Richmond, VA 23219
2. *United States District Court for the Northern District of Maryland* 101 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, MD 21201
3. *Court of Special Appeals* 361 Rowe Blvd., Annapolis, MD 21401
4. *State of Maryland, State Attorney General, Criminal Appeal Division* 200 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, MD 21204
5. *Office Chief of Police* Baltimore County (that overseas Precinct 11) 700 E. Joppa Rd., Towson, MD 21286
6. *Warden of Maryland Correctional Training Center* 18800 Roxsbury Rd., Hagerstown, MD 21746

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION 2

CONCLUSION 4

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, decided August 5, 2004 ..... App. 1

Order of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, filed March 8, 2004 ..... App. 3

Order of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, filed February 10, 2004 ..... App. 4

Order Denying Rehearing of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, filed September 8, 2004 ..... App. 6

Letter from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, dated February 4, 2005, from which the Court is setting time ..... App. 8

Judgment from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, filed August 5, 2004 ..... App. 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Fifth Amendment 2

Sixth Amendment 2

Eighth Amendment 2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Black's Law Dictionary, 7th Edition 2

Declaration of Human Rights: Arts. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11(1.2), 16(1) 2

Supreme Court Rule 10, Part III 2

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[x] For cases from **federal courts:**

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix App. 1 to the petition and is

[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix App. 4 to the petition and is

[x] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[x] For cases from **federal courts:**

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was September 8, 2004. September 5, 2004.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: September 8, 2004, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix App. 6.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Black's Law Dictionary , 7th Edition

Declaration Of Human Rights: Arts. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11(1.2), 16(1)

The Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution (rights to defend, appeal, and to be heard)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Enclosed is the denial from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Due to my mistake of interpreting this Judgment, I thought for the first time the courts had recognized that my child, who was 15 years old at the time this started, was a minor child, and had given me back my rights to handle his case. I was working against time. So, I thought the Writ of Certiorari did not apply to me. So, I ask should my child's constitutional rights to an appeal suffer because of this. Due to the high cost of legal expenses for this, I had no choice but to take it on myself. Well, not bad for a person that is not a lawyer, look how far I have gotten.

2. Supreme Court Rule 10 Part III. Jurisdiction on Writ of Certiorari. Considerations Governing Review on Certiorari section (a).

(1). Turn your attention to both the Memorandum from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, Civil Action No. RDB 04 608 wherein Emmanuel Covington was 15 years old on June 29, 2001, and the Order Civil Action No. RDB 04 287 from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. But, now look at the

Order to Strike from the Appeal to the Court of Special Appeals for Maryland, Docket 01CR2583, Decision dated 1 October 2003. My name (Hilda Floyd) was on the original Appeal; it was taken off and was replaced by my juvenile son's name. Next, 1 October 2003, Emmanuel was only 17 years old, was not tried in juvenile court first, and instead went straight to adult court. But, on U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, Order RDB 04-287-3 Para, he is considered an adult because he had turned 18 years old by this time. In both cases he was denied an Appeal; his age seemed to be the conflict. That created a conflict between two different courts which placed him in a tug-of-war between two different laws, and had tied my hands as a legal guardian in both attempts to appeal his case.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The reasons for Granting this Petition are as follows:

By sending this case back to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, I want to challenge Article 27, 36B, Pages 97-106: Article 27-59A (applicability of section – **The Circuit Courts Power to Transfer**). A problem that very much needs to be addressed. This law had created this problem and many others and will continue to do so. I am attempting to put together the rights of the parents, child and courts. I am trying to accomplish finally ending false imprisonment of juveniles, and have the courts take a closer look at the laws and problems. This exiting law was written, and no one had ever recognized (until now) that this is a bad law.

CONCLUSION

I never want anyone to go through what my child and I have gone through. So, let the lower Court try to handle this growing problem.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
(mother of minor child)
160 Alberge Lane
Baltimore, MD 21220
410-335-0191

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-6623

HILDA L. FLOYD,
Mother of Minor Child E.C.,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

THE STATE OF MARYLAND;
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Criminal Appeals Division,

Respondents-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (CA-04-287-1-RDB)

Submitted: July 29, 2004 Decided: August 5, 2004

Before LUTTIG, MICHAEL, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hilda L. Floyd, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Hilda L. Floyd seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on the habeas corpus petition she filed on behalf of her son, who is a Maryland inmate. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (2) (2000). A litigant satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell,* 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel,* 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee,* 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Floyd has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

HILDA L. FLOYD, MOTHER OF MINOR CHILD EMMANUEL COVINGTON #311-900	:	
v	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. RDB-04-287
STATE OF MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL, CRIMINAL APPEALS DIVISION	:	

ORDER

On February 10, 2004 Emmanuel Covington was ordered to submit court-approved habeas corpus forms within twenty days, or risk dismissal of the above-captioned action. (Paper No. 3). Covington has failed to respond.

Accordingly, IT IS this 5th day of March, 2004 hereby ORDERED:

1. That the above-captioned action, to the extent that it is construed as a habeas corpus or civil rights action filed on behalf of Emmanuel Covington, IS DENIED and DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE;

2. That the Clerk of Court CLOSE this case; and

3. That the Clerk of Court MAIL a copy of this Order to Hilda L. Floyd and to Emmanuel Covington, #311-900, MCTC, 18800 Roxbury Road, Hagerstown, Maryland 21746.

/s/ Richard D. Bennett
Richard D. Bennett
United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

HILDA L. FLOYD, MOTHER OF MINOR CHILD EMMANUEL COVINGTON #311-900	:	
v	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. RDB-04-287
STATE OF MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL, CRIMINAL APPEALS DIVISION	:	

ORDER

On February 2, 2004 Hilda L. Floyd filed a document entitled "Notice of Removal of Criminal Prosecution Against Person Denied Civil Rights, Habeas Corpus 28 U.S.C.A. 1443." (*See* Paper No. 1). An indigency application also was filed with the document. (*See* Paper No. 2).

Ms. Floyd's request for relief appears to be twofold: first, she complains that her civil rights may have been violated in connection with police action taken in 2001 against her son, Emmanuel Covington. To the extent that Ms. Floyd wishes to file a civil rights action **on her own behalf** for wrongs against her, she may do so by requesting the appropriate forms from the Clerk of Court, and filing the forms in this Court as a new civil action. She next complains that her son was wrongfully prosecuted and convicted in Baltimore County. Although she couches these allegations in the context of a removal proceedings, such allegations are properly brought before this Court by way of a habeas corpus action filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The attachments to the original document give Emmanuel Covington's birth date as October 15, 1985, a date confirmed by Maryland Division of Correction [DOC] personnel. He thus is not a "minor" and, absent cause, will be required to file the appropriate habeas corpus forms and pursue any habeas corpus action in this Court on his own (or through counsel), rather than through his mother.

Accordingly, IT IS this 10th day of February, 2004 by this Court hereby ORDERED that:

1. Mr. Covington **IS GRANTED** an additional **TWENTY (20) DAYS** in which to file a properly completed habeas corpus petition. Mr. Covington is warned that failure to fill out and submit the petition and indigency affidavit may result in dismissal of his case, without prejudice;

2. Ms. Floyd **IS DISMISSED** from this case;

3. Ms. Floyd **IS DENIED** leave to file *in forma pauperis;* and

4. The Clerk of Court shall **MAIL** a copy of this Order to Ms. Floyd at her Alberge Lane address; and shall also **MAIL** a copy of this Order, together with a 28 U.S.C. §2254 habeas corpus packet, to Emmanuel Covington, #311-900, MCTC, 18800 Roxbury Road, Hagerstown, Maryland 21746.

/s/ Richard D. Bennett
Richard D. Bennett
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

FILED September 8, 2004

No. 04-6623
CA-04-287-1-RDB

HILDA L. FLOYD, Mother of Minor Child E.C.

Petitioner-Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND; ATTORNEY GENERAL, Criminal Appeals Division

Respondents-Appellees

On Petition for Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc

The appellant's petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc was submitted to this Court. As no member of this Court or the panel requested a poll on the petition for rehearing en banc, and

As the panel considered the petition for rehearing and is of the opinion that it should be denied,

IT IS ORDERED that the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc is denied.

Entered for a panel comprised of Judge Duncan, Judge Luttig, and Judge Michael.

For the Court,

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Patricia S. Connor
CLERK

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
Lewis F. Powell, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex
1100 E. Main Street, Suite 501
Richmond, Virginia 23219-3517

Patricia S. Connor
Clerk

www.ca4.uscourts.gov

Telephone
(804) 916-2700

February 4, 2005

Hilda L. Floyd
160 Alberge Lane
Baltimore, MD 21220

Re: 04-6623 Floyd v. State of MD
CA-04-287-1-RDB

Dear Ms. Floyd:

I am returning your petition for writ of certiorari.

This petition must be filed directly with the Clerk's Office for the **Supreme Court** in Washington. I am enclosing an information sheet regarding this procedure.

If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the Clerk's Office for the Supreme Court of the United States at (202) 479-3000.

Yours truly,

PATRICIA S. CONNOR
Clerk

By: /s/ Lisa D. Nesbitt
Deputy Clerk

Enclosure(s)

JUDGMENT

FILED: August 5, 2004

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

for the

Fourth Circuit

NO. 04-6623
CA-04-287-1-RDB

HILDA L. FLOYD, Mother of Minor Child E.C.

Petitioner-Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF MARYLAND; ATTORNEY GENERAL, Criminal Appeals Division

Respondents-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at Baltimore

---

In accordance with the written opinion of this Court filed this day, the Court denies a certificate of appealability and dismisses the appeal.

A certified copy of this judgment will be provided to the District Court upon issuance of the mandate. The judgment will take effect upon issuance of the mandate.

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Patricia S. Connor
CLERK

---

(2)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 8 - 2005
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 04-1211

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
(mother of minor child) E.C.,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
160 Alberge Lane
Baltimore, MD 21220
410-335-0191

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. Who really has the power to waiver a child before he has been charged?
2. Should the state follow the same guidelines as the federal?
3. Does a child first have to be emancipated?
4. At what age does society put a child in front of a judge and say defend yourself?
5. What are you telling society about the law?
6. At what point do we draw the line on juvenile?
7. Is it about time we clear this matter up?
8. When I had asked for the transcripts from this case, they for some fact have been omitted or changed; this is not the first time. How true is a transcript supposed to be? I want his juvenile record read.
9. My child was on probation but in my custody, and Master Gilbert was not told of this case. Should he have been notified first?
10. If my child was an adult, he would have been arraigned much faster than this. Was the court confused?
11. January thru June my son was prosecuted every month. Could this fall under Vigorous Prosecution or Obstruction of Justice or both?
12. Do I have the right to challenge Mr. Bass' accusations and face our Accuser?

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

Mr. Steven M. Sullivan, Assistant Attorney General
200 Saint Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-576-6324

Public Defender – Jerri Peyton-Braden
500 Virginia Ave.
Towson, MD 21204
410-324-8919

Prosecutor James Gentry
Room 511
401 Bosley Ave.
Towson, MD 21204
410-887-6600

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
LIST OF PARTIES	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	4
CONCLUSION	6
CERTIFICATION	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Gariety v. Fleming, 121 Kan. 42, 245 P. 1054 5

In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967) 2, 3, 6

In re Winship, 358 U.S. 397 (1969) 5

Lake v. State, 100 Fla. 373, 129 So. 827 4

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966) 2, 5

Norris v. Alabama, 294 U.S. 587 (1935) 6

People v. Harkans, 109 Colo. 177, 123 P.2d 824 5

Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932) 6

Russel v. Levinsohn, 5 N.J. Misc. 765, 138 A. 205 5

State v. Montgomery, 94 Me. 192, 47 A. 165 4

State v. Shaw, 73 Vt. 149, 50 A. 863 5

U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196 6

Wallace v. Cox, 136 Tenn. 69, 188 S.W. 611, L.R.A. 1918B, 690 4

Zucher v. The Stanford Daily, 436 U.S. 547 1

CONSTITUTIONS

Fifth and Sixth Amendment; Civil Rights Act of 1964 4

OTHER

Black's Law Dictionary Revised, Fourth Edition 3, 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On June 26, 2001, around 12 a.m., the police came to my apartment to question my 15-year-old son Emmanuel Seth Covington, stating that a drive-by shooting had just occurred around 11:05 p.m. No arrest was made that night.

Around June 28, I was denied the right to file a counter charge against Mr. Bass to see what he based his charges on.

On June 29, 2001, at about 12 a.m., Emmanuel Seth Covington was taken into custody from my house by Detective Hanna of the 11th precinct. She had told me, "that he was being charged as an adult." Detective Hanna and two other detectives had stayed behind to search my house, with half the police force waiting outside. I had an 18 month and 2½ year old, my grandchildren, in the house. I just went on and gave her permission. She had admitted that she did not have a search or arrest warrant; she claimed it will take too long to wake a judge. I gave her permission, and the search was limited to my child's room. ***Zucher v. The Stanford Daily*, 436 U.S. 547, which deals with search and seizure, and a third party. The apartment is in my name, not my son's, even though I was an innocent third party. I should have been given a subpoena, and the child should have been arrested outside the premises. That would make the search illegal. Or on the other hand, if the child was charged as a Juvenile and I had complete control and rights over my child, then the search would have been legal.** Around 4:45 a.m., Detective Hanna left with the K-9 unit. I followed the detective back to the station arriving about 4:55 a.m. I

was told by Detective Hanna once again that Emmanuel had been locked up with adults and charged as an adult, and that I could not see him. While in police control, Emmanuel somehow had signed a *Miranda* Waiver without my presence. **(FRUIT-OF-THE-POISONOUS-TREE DOCTRINE; *In re Gault*).** Emmanuel was taken to the commissioner, processed and treated as an adult. **(*In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), page 1-1; 2-2-3-4); *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 466 (1966).**

On July 2, 2001, he went for a bail hearing. I was present. He was lead in and chained to other adult prisoners. By now my child had spent the weekend in the same cell with adults. Bail was denied . . .

Emmanuel was transferred to the Detention Center located in Towson, from the 11th precinct, then DOC in Baltimore City. Now he is at MCTC, an all adult facility. His treatment while in the detention center: he was locked down, denied visitation several times, sometimes as long as 7 days to 21 days because he was a Juvenile. **(USCA Code Annotated Crimes and Criminal Procedure *18-5039. No Juvenile committed, whether pursuant to an adjudication of delinquency or conviction for an offense, to the custody of the Attorney General may not be placed or retained in an Adult Jail or correctional Institution.)**

On July 12, 2001, Emmanuel was to appear in Juvenile Court (he was on probation). He was a no show. Master Gilbert was not told of his arrest until that day. Master Gilbert had asked about Emmanuel being arraigned and charged, and had asked why he wasn't told and shook his head when he found out that Emmanuel had not been arraigned. **(Master Gilbert should have been the first**

one notified, and he should have appeared in front of him instead of an Adult court).

Around mid-July '01, a grand jury had taken place. I was not notified.

On August 1, 2001, Arraignment was held in front of Hon. John G. Turnbull II. I was not notified nor was any lawyer. My son was told that he better hire a lawyer. **(*In re Gault* pages 39-41 "rights to be represented by counsel. . . .)** And yet no one had noticed that the child was not being represented by counsel or his parent to avoid the following: **Black's Law Dictionary Revised, Fourth Edition, Definition, Incriminated, *In re Dendy*, Tex.Civ.App.**

Attorney Jerri Peyton-Braden's appearance was entered on September 13, 2001 (I was turned down by the Public Defender's office from obtaining an attorney. They claimed I had no rights, the child was an adult.) In July, my child was permitted to hire sign for a public defender in September. **(Contract law, hiring or obtaining lawyers is a contract, child could not enter any.)**

On January 9, 2003, Trial: Hon. Robert N. Dugan, and Trial Sentence. That was when Attorney Jerri Peyton-Braden told my son "your mother said to take the plea bargain under the Alford plea." I was not allowed to be in the room nor talk to my child. *I said jury trial.* **(Since when could a lawyer lie to their clients?)**

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The reasons for Granting this petition for rehearing are as follow: Emmanuel needs a second consideration of cause for sole purpose of calling to the court's attention any ***oversight*** in this case would be the facts that I have just mentioned. **Black's definition of *Rehearing*. *Lake v. State*, 100 Fla. 373, 129 So. 827, 829. *Omission*** would be the neglect from the lawyer and judges to perform what the law requires. He also has the right to have those facts brought out in court without prejudice or trickery and also has the right to be treated like the other two boys cleared of all charges and his record expunged. **Due Process (Fifth and Sixth Amendment; Civil Rights Act of 1964.)**

Three children were placed into custody that night, one Japanese, one white. Case No: 01J3156, both 16 year olds were turned free due to lack of evidence.

The white child was placed that night in a cell by himself. He was granted bail. His case was later bought down to Juvenile court where he was released with not guilty for lack of evidence. He was the only witness against my son; he later admitted he was lying. **Black's Dictionary definition of EQUAL BY SEPARATION LAW; EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS, *State v. Montgomery*, 94 Me. 192, 47 A. 165. (EMANCIPATION – *Wallace v. Cox*, 136 Tenn. 69, 188 S.W. 611, 612, L.R.A. 1918B, 690).**

No one was hurt, no gun was found, and the boys were miles away at one of the child's homes. Two bullets were found, one in the woodwork in front of the garage and the other inside across the garage in a sack of grass seeds. One shell was found in the neighbor's driveway which

could have been there God knows when. He should have never been charged with attempted murder. Description: Facing the area; the neighbor's driveway, then a row of tall trees that start at a few feet from the street which lead straight back to the garage blocking all view of the garage (100 yards from the street). The detached garage faces the street and to the right is a big above-ground pool that sits between the garage and the house. The length of the house from the back to the front is large, then the rest is all front yard. The driveway is narrow, and the garage had a pool table in it so the car had to park outside. A .380 caliber gun was used. This is a gun that is half the size of a .45, a little larger than a .22. The range is 10 yards, meaning you have to be very close to your target. How, while the car was moving did several bullets travel 100 yards while missing the house, the pool, the parked cars, the pool table and the trees? Officer Hanna measured only the length between the neighbor's driveway to the house. **(False and Misleading Statement, *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Okin*, C.C.A.N.Y., 132).**

Another reason due to the recent Supreme Court Ruling: **recent *Miranda* Decision; over the children and their limits of understanding the law, reasonable doubt and false imprisonment, *People v. Harkans*, 109 Colo. 177, 123 P.2d 824; Imprisonment, *State v. Shaw*, 73 Vt. 149, 50 A. 863; No Discovery, if he was an adult he would have that right, False arrest, *Gariety v. Fleming*, 121 Kan. 42, 245 P. 1054, 1055; *Russel v. Levinsohn*, 5 N.J. Misc. 765, 138 A. 205; *Parens Patriae, In re Gault* and *In re Winship*, 358 U.S. 397 (1969) page 374. "A delinquency determination, to some extent at least, stigmatizes a youth in that it is by definition bottomed on a finding that**

the accused committed a crime . . . it is far worse to declare an innocent youth a delinquent . . . Page 378; Our Constitution provides that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; *Connecticut v. Michael Skakel*, Part A. the Juvenile Section: but reverse (juvenile to adult) here adult was placed in juvenile over a 20 or more case. . . . In this case the Prosecutor had full control over this child. The court had acted as *parens patriae* **(Scottsboro Case, *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932); Scottsboro Case, *Norris v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1935),** this case is identical. If Emmanuel was an adult, he would not be treated this way, he would be guaranteed due process. **(*In re Gault*, page 4, 1 para.)**

CONCLUSION

***U.S. v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196: No man in the country is so high that he or she is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance, with impunity. All the Officers of the Government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it.** When a child is born, who do they rely on for food, shelter, clothing, thinking? A child's understanding is very limited and we as adults, parents should be in front. If my child breaks your window, who do you sue? Children have no rights, then who bears that burden? I was treated as the child, my son was treated as the parent. Make my child whole.

The petition for a rehearing of writ of certiorari should granted.

Respectfully submitted,

HILDA LEAH FLOYD
(mother of minor child) E.C.
160 Alberge Lane
Baltimore, MD 21220
410-335-0191

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this Petition for Rehearing is submitted in good faith and not for delay. This Petition for Rehearing is restricted to the grounds set out in Rule 44.2.

_____
Hilda Leah Floyd